

10/11/88  
Minutes of a Public Hearing for the application of Alvin Benjamin D.E.I.S. for proposed condominium project on Middle Road in Riverhead, held by the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead in the Riverhead Town Hall, Riverhead, New York on October 14, 1986 at 7:30 p.m.

Present: Joseph F. Janoski, Supervisor  
John Lombardi, Councilman  
Victor Prusinowski, Councilman  
Louis Boschetti, Councilman  
Robert Pike, Councilman

Also Present: Richard Ehlers, Town Attorney

Supervisor Janoski called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Supervisor Janoski, "This hearing is being held as part of the process of the State Environmental Quality Review Act. The hearing is called for the purpose of giving the public the opportunity to comment on the draft environmental impact statement which has been prepared by the applicant. The purpose of this hearing is to determine whether the applicants have adequately addressed in their environmental impact statement the issues which were raised at the scoping hearing which was held several weeks ago. In the process of this application and it is a special permit use, the Town Board must go through the environmental questions first in compliance with the State Environmental Quality Review Act which I referred to. There is also a process which will be necessary dealing with the special permit. Condominium construction is a special permitted use in the Residence C zone which is the zone of the land in question in the application. That special permit procedure requires that the application for review to the Planning Board for their review and recommendations and that it come back to the Town Board at which time we will hold a public hearing on the issuance of the special permit itself. The question here tonight is the document which has been prepared by the applicants. It is referred to as the draft form of the environmental impact statement and we follow a 30 day period in which the public has an opportunity to submit written comment with a public hearing to give the citizens the opportunity to express their views at this hearing. Having said that, I would recognize the representative of the applicant, Henry."

Henry Saxtein, Esq., "Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Henry Saxtein. I maintain offices at 860 East Main Street, Riverhead and I represent the applicant, Alvin Benjamin. Mr. Benjamin is a building contractor from Hempstead who has for many years, constructed the types of condominiums that he has proposed for this parcel of property. The parcel of property, as you know, is on the northerly side of Middle Road in Riverhead and adjacent to John Wesley Village. The applicant has proposed to construct 181 condominium units on this parcel of property. The units will be buffered from the John Wesley Village by a 10 plus or minus acre buffer area and on the northerly side by a 9 plus or minus acre buffer area. Currently on the easterly side of this property is a

Henry Saxtein, Continued

farm and on the westerly side is a housing development. The subject premises are in the hamlet area of the Town of Riverhead and it will be serviced by the Riverhead Water District and the Riverhead Sewer District. The applicant has made an application to the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead for a special permit for this project. The meeting here tonight is for the purpose of addressing the draft environmental impact statement which has been prepared for this project by Holzmacher, McLendon and Murrell. We hope to address all the issues that were raised at the scoping hearing and we wish to address any additional issues which are brought forth tonight and we will address them as the Town Board requests us to. I believe at this time that the Supervisor will open up the hearing to people wishing to be heard. But just prior to that, I would just like to place on the table some renderings of what the cluster development is proposed to look like with the buffer areas and artist renderings of what one of the quads of the cluster will look like. I'll leave them right up here on the desk."

Supervisor Janoski, "I'll have the tripod brought in Henry and we can put it (I guess) over there. No. I forgot about my friend there with his comfortable seat."

Lady from Audience, "Will you speak a little louder please. There are people have hearing difficulties and are present in the audience. And I believe we have a little bit of trouble hearing what you're saying, so would you please speak a little louder."

Supervisor Janoski, "Ok. While we're waiting for the tripod to be brought in, I'm going to start recognizing citizens who wish to be heard. But I would like to indicate for the record of this proceeding, Irene if you will hold them up, that we received a lot of mail concerning this application and of course will be made a part of the record of the proceedings. We got your letters. Whatever you think is good. You can't put it there because they're going to show slides."

Henry Saxtein, "Can everyone see over there?"

Councilman Boschetti, "Probably not."

Supervisor Janoski, "That seems fine to me if..."

Councilman Lombardi, "Why don't you put it right in the front there."

Supervisor Janoski, "Why don't you put it right in the front there. Thank you Henry. Ok. In a hearing, just so that I can point out the procedure, the Town Board is here to hear the points of view of the citizens who have gathered here for that purpose. And it is the Town Board which should be addressed. Certainly we don't want to have a debate between the citizens of the town and the applicants. So you should address your comments to us. That's why we're here and we're here to listen and hear your point of view. I would like to recognize at this time Marianne White."

10/11/88  
PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Marianne White, 134 Nadel Drive, Riverhead, "Mr. Supervisor and members of the Town Council. My name is Marianne White. I am a member of the Roanoke Homes Civic Association. I'm not a public speaker. My address is 134 Nadel Drive in Riverhead. The Roanoke Homes Civic Association wishes to thank the Town Board for giving us and our neighbors the opportunity for a public hearing to address the D.E.I.S. of the Alvin Benjamin project. I wish to submit 2 petitions to the Town Board. One is signed by 97 residents of the immediate area that will be effected by this project. The other was geared for the residents of John Wesley Village specifically in response to the D.E.I.S. section; 5.4.2 page 108. It was signed by 40 of the John Wesley residents. I also wish to submit 7 letters from some of those residents of John Wesley Village. As our outline indicates, we would like to present 3 topics of concern and 2 alternatives to the town with respect to the developers D.E.I.S. May I submit these petitions?"

Supervisor Janoski, "Yes please. Irene could I see the petition?"

Marianne White, "Mr. Janoski may I call our first speaker?"

Supervisor Janoski, "Well actually I know who it is and I got to do that. But are you ready?"

Marianne White, "Thank you very much."

Supervisor Janoski, "I just wanted to take a moment to look at the petitions. I would like to call John. I should have let you do it because I'm having trouble with this last name. Myrden? Myrden. John, by the way, the slide presentation, when is that to be?"

John Myrden, 56 Nadel Drive, "That will be at the end Mr. Janoski. After the first 3 speakers. Mr. Supervisor, Councilmen, good evening. My name is John Myrden and I reside at 56 Nadel Drive in Riverhead, New York. As you can in the outline of our agenda, topics I will cover are Municipal and Education services in relation to the developer's D.E.I.S. That will be page 1 in your handouts. I will start with municipal services which have no relation to the handout. It is a generally accepted fact that single-family dwellings in the price range such as the condominiums proposed, do not generate sufficient taxes to cover the public services provided to them. Given this fact, taxes on all residents must be raised to cover the "net loss" of tax revenues associated with this type of development. This results in the existing Riverhead taxpayers actually subsidizing the town services provided to these new homes. While the D.E.I.S. does touch upon some aspects of the developments' impact on municipal services, it by no means, adequately address the financial impact to the taxpayers of Riverhead. We, therefore, request that the preparer (H2M) be direct to estimate this financial impact with particular emphasis on the following town services:

- 1). The Riverhead Sanitary Landfill.
- 2). The Highway Department.
- 3). Police, Fire and Health services.
- 4). The Riverhead Water District.

John Myrden, Continued

5). The Riverhead Sewer District with special attention to the fact that the district is operating at capacity and that the treatment plant would be required to expand to accomodate this development. I would now like to rebut the preparer's estimate on the impact to the Riverhead Central School District which does effect the handout. Before I discuss our estimates, I would like to point out some of the preparer's errors and more importantly, the obvious statistical bias used in the preparer's estimate. On page 106 of the D.E.I.S., the amount of New York State aid is erroneously doubled to calculate the Riverhead taxpayer's cost to educate one child. A 1,525 dollar error. On page 104 and 105, the preparer states that 24% of the school children from this development will attend private school. The figure is derived by using the total number of students in the Riverhead School system. This 24% figure does not take into consideration the great many private and parochial school students who do not reside within the Riverhead School District; a district which has a great deal more private schools than the surrounding public school district. The actual percentage of Riverhead School District resident students in private schools is therefore lower than the 24% stated by the preparer. To know the true percentage of private school students who reside within the Riverhead School District, we recommend that the school district be contacted by the preparer to find out the actual number and adjust this percent accordingly. For the sake of argument, we have prepared our estimate graphic which you have in front of you, calculating the percentage of private school students at 12% and 24%. You will also note the column using the median multiplier of .55 students per unit has been added. It is stressed however, that the column using the .90 students per unit is in all likelihood, the most appropriate multiplier since on page 106, the developer states that the average selling price per condo will be \$101,000 and that on page 103 the preparer relates, (quote) .90 children per unit for lower priced units under \$100,000 at the Coventry Stratmore Condominium project, (end of quote). The Coventry Stratmore Condominium project is in Brookhaven. We would think that the comparison is as obvious to you as it is to us. Our estimate graphic explains the rest. Even conceding the 24% private school rate, the loss to the Riverhead School District would be over 400,000 dollars per year. At 12%, the loss approaches 500,000 dollars. One half million dollars per year. We would ask the developer if he really expects the taxpayers of Riverhead to tolerate these costs. On more general note, we would request that when the preparer is making the next version of the D.E.I.S., that the following guidelines be observed: 1). That all references be properly footnoted. They are not in the current D.E.I.S. 2). That appropriate New York State, Suffolk County, Riverhead Town, Riverhead School District, Riverhead Water District and Riverhead Sewer District officials be contacted and solicited for input relative to the statements made by the preparer in the draft environmental impact statement. And 3). that all contacts made for references and information, be done so in writing and that the requests and the responses be submitted with the D.E.I.S. as an appendix. Gentlemen, thank you. I would like to now (that's yours)...."

Irene Pendzick, "John, Mr. Myrden, would I be able to get a copy of your statement. May I get a copy of that later. Thank you."

PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Supervisor Janoski, "Let me point out that the presentation which we are seeing or will see and are hearing, is being made by the Roanoke Homes Civic Association. I would like to recognize Mr. David White."

David White, 134 Nadel Drive, "Good evening Mr. Supervisor and Councilmen. My name is David White. I reside at 134 Nadel Drive. As a member of the Roanoke Homes Civic Association, I will address the topic of traffic. It is our prime objection to have any additional traffic flow through Nadel Court thus involving Nadel Drive and Joyce Drive. Our main concern is the safety of the neighborhood children, many of whom play in the street and walk to school. It has also been observed that track and cross country teams do utilize these for their practice run area. It should be noted that the local peak traffic hours are 7 to 8 a.m. and 9 to 10 a.m. and 5 to 6 p.m. With many children being in the streets during these hours, additional traffic flow will increase the potential safety hazard. It should be noted that school buses do travel through this area several times a day also. On page 77 of the D.E.I.S. it is stated that Mercy High and Riverhead High School do present a potential source of pedestrian movement. Because this study was performed in the summer months, it is our wish that actual confirmation be performed during the school year so as to seriously address the issue. It is observed that entering Middle Road from Aldersgate, presents more difficulty during the school year and winter months and that Nadel Drive is only a short distance from Aldersgate. Additionally, and although not within the immediate area, the traffic conditions of the Route 58 traffic circle are not mentioned in the D.E.I.S. We, as a group, would like to see this issue addressed particularly during the a.m. and p.m. commutation hours when school sessions begin and end and also during shift changes at both Central Suffolk Hospital and Riverhead Nursing Homes. This must be considered in view of the fact that traffic from Joyce Drive, Nadel, Roanoke, Ostrander and Aldersgate travels through the Route 58 traffic circle in order to reach the local commercial district. It would also be wise to consider the fact that any further increase in traffic may result in an inability to get to the Central Suffolk Hospital Emergency Room during peak traffic flow hours. If the traffic can't move, neither can the ambulances. Please note that on page 118, there is a discrepancy regarding trip ends. In the proposed unit, the D.E.I.S. calculates 5 trip ends per unit and the Roanoke Homes area is listed at 10 trip ends per unit. Perhaps this should be clarified. We would also like to state that it has come to our attention that the pavement on Nadel Drive and Aldersgate is specially designed for low-volume traffic flow. In closing, I would like to offer the following suggestions: Number 1, that future traffic studies be documented with the use of metered devices. 2. That all local accident reports in the immediate vicinity be presented in any further versions of the D.E.I.S. And 3: that future facts regarding traffic flow be confirmed through the New York State Department of Transportation, the County of Suffolk and the Town of Riverhead. Thank you very much."

Supervisor Janoski, "Thank you Dave. And now addressing the topic of water, Marianne White."

PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Marianne White, "My name is Marianne White and you already have my address."

Supervisor Janoski, "You have to do all that over again."

Marianne White, "I live at 134 Nadel Drive in Riverhead and I'm a member of the Roanoke Homes Civic Association. The topic I will discuss is water; its availability and quality. The water supply for our region is obtained entirely from ground water. The source of potable water originates from precipitation and percolates to the underground aquifer. The entire project site is contained within the water budget area. This means that this area contributes to recharge of groundwater. Furthermore, the site is within the hydrogeologic Zone IV. This zone is characterized as a shallow horizontal flow system which generally impacts surface waters. On page 31 and 32 of the D.E.I.S. the permissive sustained yield is discussed with respect to the project site, and a figure of 57,000 gallons per day was derived as the permissive sustained yield at the site. On page 92 and 93 of the D.E.I.S., it is stated that almost all of the water usage is consumptive because the water will not be returned to the aquifer. Using the preparer's figures (p. 93) the project's projected average water use is 47,060 gallons per day for the 181 dwelling units. This figure is the net loss to the aquifer. Referring back to section 3.2.1 (pages 32 and 33 of the D.E.I.S.), it is deduced by the preparer that the consumptive needs of the project is 82% of the permissive yield for the site. An obvious flaw in this logic is that the construction of 181 condominiums with the accompanying paving, roadways, parking lots, etc., significantly alters the ability of the parcel site to avail the average recharge attributed to it. Instead of 82% of the permissive yield, the projected average water consumption exceeds the permissive yield by 2.3 times. In other words, in excess of 23%. Section 5.7.1 (D.E.I.S. page 120) states that there will be an adverse impact on the public water supply of the area, we request that the water district of the Town of Riverhead be advised of the permissive yield vs. consumption discrepancy and that the capacity/status of the town's well and pumping facilities be determined in light of exceeding a permissive sustained yield by 230% daily. That is project impact for a 10 year period on the Riverhead well system. According to the 208 Study, as consumptive use increases, groundwater is taken from storage and underflow to stream and the sea is reduced. These stresses on the groundwater system result in water level declines and saltwater encroachment. Large water table declines would result from withdrawal at permissive sustained yield rates if most areas were sewered and effluents were discharged by ocean fallout. Significant long term reductions in ground water outflow and stream flow to the various saltwater bodies surrounding L.I. may alter salinities. Repercussions to marshlands and bays are discussed in detail on pages 104 and 107 of the 208 study volume 1. The depth to the water table is quite shallow in the project site. The mean value of the five sample wells (page 35 of the D.E.I.S.) is only 11.6 feet from the ground level, not 15 feet as stated on page 33 of the D.E.I.S.. Since sample well #51572 is the closest to the project site, it should be included in the groundwater depth analysis. As stated previously such shallow horizontal flow systems impact surface waters. If the roadway, runoff, debris ponding

PUBLIC HEARING ContinuedMarianne White, Continued

areas discussed in the D.E.I.S. are constructed, will they become contiguous with the very shallow water table or how large will they be? This land is obvious headwaters to other streams in Riverhead, whereas it is imperative to preserve our wetlands, as demonstrated in the 208 study. These streambeds can dry up if there is a disruption of their source (both in quantity and quality). In closing the protection of ground water quality involves both the elimination or mitigation of existing problems and the prevention of new ones. (208 study section 1.4.1.3 page 6) Although this hearing is focused on the merits of the D.E.I.S., blinders must not be worn. Riverhead is at the threshold to the point of no return ecologically. To quote from SEQRA: in adopting SEQRA, it was the legislature's intention that all agencies conduct their affairs with no awareness that they are steward of the air, water, land and living resources and that they have an obligation to protect the environment for the use and enjoyment of this and all future generations. Thank you very much."

Supervisor Janoski, "And now we come to part 3 of this presentation which is proposed alternatives. And for that purpose, I will recognize Mr. Rob Goldman."

Rob Goldman, 442 Medford St., Mass., "I'm a member of Roanoke Homes Civic Association and I'm here tonight representing my parents; Dr. and Mrs. John Goldman and my brother David Goldman who can not make it tonight. I would like to read a brief statement and then we'd like to show the slide show. It may take a few minutes to get it set up with the screen. Please note that in the slide show presentation, we state that we will not require parking spaces in the alternative subsequent design work as included some car and bus parking, you can refer to the diagram that we have. Roanoke Civic Association proposes that the 52 acre area be minimally altered to provide low impact recreation including: hiking, horseback riding, jogging and nature studies. Additionally, the area would be used for nature education field studies for Riverhead school children. The area would be named the McKay preserve in honor of the former owners and long time Riverhead residents. This alternative preserves irreplaceable groundwater recharge capacity, safeguards the headwaters of Terry and Sawmill Creeks and maintains valuable wildlife habitat. Fair compensation to the property owners would be achieved through the financing available from the New York State Land and Water Conservation Fund administered by the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation. Riverhead has received funding from this source in the past. Additionally, funding will be forthcoming through LOPRH and the Department of Environmental Quality Bond Act. In comparison to the net loss in town revenue which would be engendered by this 181 condominium development. The loss of property tax revenue engendered by public acquisition of the land would be very small. We encourage the Town Board to work in conjunction with Roanoke Homes Civic Association, the property owners and County and State agencies to make the McKay Preserve a reality. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski, "Thank you. Whenever you're ready let me know so I can have the lights dimmed. Are you ready? Ok. Let the record show that the Town Board is seeing a slide presentation as being presented by Rob Goldman."

ROB GOLDMAN PRESENTED A NARRATED SLIDE SHOW DEPICTING SUBURBANIZATION OF RIVERHEAD AND THE ALTERNATIVE TO BE PRESERVATION.

Supervisor Janoski, "Rob, are you using a tape to narrate this? Ok. Would you do me a favor and take the microphone off the stand and put it down next to your recorder so we'll get the whole thing on the record."

SLIDE PRESENTATION PROCEEDED FOR APPROXIMATELY 5 MINUTES

Supervisor Janoski, "Ok. I'd like to recognize Lynn Berezny."

Lynn Berezny, 133 Nadel Drive, "Mr. Supervisor and Councilmen; I too protest the building of 181 condominium units and the impact it will have on our neighborhood and Riverhead Town. The second alternative we would like to present tonight is a 35-unit single family housing development. A copy of this plan can be found in your information packet. Individual homes would be more consistent with the existing neighborhood. This alternative will call for upzoning of the land to residential A. The one-acre homes will lessen the negative impact on Riverhead and its residents by providing for a gradual increase of families moving into our community. The homes will be occupied at a slower pace than condominiums. Thereby giving us time to adapt our schools and town services to accomodate the influx of people. The individual houses also generate less traffic onto our already crowded roadways. The taxes that people will pay on the one-acre housing will be more adequate than the condominiums in covering the monies needed for town schools and services. The noise level of a residential A development would be substantially less than 181 "clustered" condos. We in Roanoke Homes and John Wesley enjoy the peaceful safe atmosphere that our neighborhood provides. Please do not allow this high density cluster zoned condominium complex to be built adjacent to our neighborhood. Members of the Town Board please protect your Riverhead residents quality of life. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski, "Thank you. I want to commend you all on the professional manner in which you have made your presentation and the fact that everyone knew that they were supposed to read their name and address and you did a fine job. I'd like to recognize now some representatives of John Wesley Village Senior Citizen Club. Mrs. Marjorie McKinney."



PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Marjorie McKinney, John Wesley Village, "My name is Marjorie McKinney. I reside in the John Wesley Retirement Village. My address is 1 Aldersgate, Apt 1207. I am here to protest the 181 condominium complex contract vendee. Access to this complex has been suggested to run through Aldersgate, the main road of John Wesley Retirement Village. This arrangement would be a decided hazard to the many handicapped, wheelchair bound, walker dependent, legally blind, hearing impaired and just those of us there who have reached the prime of our lives where we can not move as quickly as we once did. To get our mail, Aldersgate is crossed many times a day. We, as residents, are against such hazard conditions. A D.E.I.S. point; page 108 section 5.4.2, mentioned we would feel less isolated by having more people introduced into our midsts and we would enjoy babysitting for some of the people of this complex. That the economical gain from babysitting would afford us an extra income. This is not the truth. Most of us have babysat, house sat for our children, grandchildren and in some cases, great grandchildren. But now are looking for what we were told would be a quite and serene community to retire to. The sound of school buses on split sessions, the delivery and utilities trucks, the flow of 500 or more cars travelling along our main road at all times of day and night can only add to the annoyance of the John Wesley Retirement Village. In closing, I wish to voice the sentiment of the residents of John Wesley Retirement Village that we are opposed to any intrusions on our present way of life. Thank you."

Irene J. Pendzick, "Mrs. McKinney, may I have a copy of that later? If you'd like, I can get a copy made."

Supervisor Janoski, "Mrs. Margaret Melito."

Margaret Melito, John Wesley Village, "Mr. Supervisor, members of the Board. The use of Aldersgate in John Wesley Retirement Village as an access route to the proposed condominium is a deep concern to all residents, particularly and especially the safety factor should 500 plus additional cars travel that road. To the many residents who are infirm, suffer respiratory and hear ailments or are hearing and are visually impaired dodging traffic, breathing exhaust emissions would be hazardous to their health and well being and we see a need for protected crosswalks, speed limit signs and stop signs, plus police patrols to insure they were obeyed. With such an influx of traffic we fear Aldersgate would constantly be in disrepair and we wonder who would take responsibility for these repairs plus the installing of adequate street lights and a traffic signal at Middle Road and Aldersgate. Residents depend on Parcel Post and store deliveries for necessities and prescriptions that they cannot get to purchase themselves and others have meals on wheels brought to their apartments. These vehicles would find stopping while making such deliveries difficult with the added traffic. We have been responsible citizens to the community and the town and we strongly urge you not to allow Aldersgate to be used as an access to the condominiums should they be built so we may maintain our present quality of life and look forward to our "Golden Years". Thank you."

10/11/88  
PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Supervisor Janoski, "Thank you. Is there anyone else present who wishes to address the Board on the matter of this application? Henry."

Henry Pfeiffer, Wading River, "I'm president of the Suffolk County Senior Council which most of you gentlemen know is an umbrella group that represents senior organizations out in the five eastern towns. Shall I repeat myself? Do you want this recorded? Ok. Fine. As such, one of our members which is John Wesley Village Senior Citizens Club, has asked me to make comment on this and I have to say that I can concur thoroughly with these statistics presented earlier by some of the people from Roanoke Civic Association and with the sentiments expressed by the two preceding speakers. The position I would like to remark as follows: the elderly of this concerned community work, planned and saved to insure that the days left for them might be spent in quiet dignity and security. Finances depleted by inflation, health eroded by time, they saw sanctuary in John Wesley Village. And after waiting patiently three, four and even five years, were finally welcomed into this friendly community for this promise of quiet and safety. Today these people, some infirmed visually and/or hearing impaired, products of the ravages of time have sacrificed military or public service or simply that of providing for and rearing a family, find their refuge threatened by the incursion of a gigantic housing development at their very doorstep. Most disturbing onto them, most dangerous is the planned traffic artery through John Wesley Village and its resulting drastic increase of vehicular traffic through this quiet and safe community. There must be alternative roads that bypass this community. We request that no building permit be granted until such alternative access is made an integral part of this plan. I believe that the mandate of safety, safety, safety for all overrides any consideration of any economic impact. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski, "Thank you Henry."

Vivian Bell, John Wesley Village, "Good evening gentlemen. My name is Vivian Bell and I reside at the John Wesley Village and this is how I feel about it. It seems when it comes to the older people, we are always being shoved to the wall. The youth get help medical attention and have babies on top of babies and yet we at Wesley Village, all we want is peace and quite. Why can't our last years be the best? Why should we put up with the noise and the pollution? Maybe when we get older we should all drop dead and that would solve the problem. But you know gentlemen, my suggestion is a park. And looking at each and every one of you, just keep living, you're going to get older. So God help you and you help her."

Supervisor Janoski, "Is there anyone else present who wishes to address the Board on the matter of this application?"

Daniel Roberts, Nadel Drive, "Mr. Supervisor, members of the Council. I don't know if any of you have driven up Nadel Drive. I know you have John. You went up there often. The amount of children on the street where there is no sidewalk whatsoever. So the kids when they walk up and down the street, have to be on the road."

PUBLIC HEARING Continued

Daniel Roberts, Continued

People that live in the area, we all know that and we take care. I wonder what is going to happen when another 300 cars or so per day coming down Nadel Drive with these little 5, 6, 7 year olds playing in the street. I think it's a dangerous situation. It should be cutting down right now and go no farther. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski, "Ok. A couple of things I want to add to the record. One; that the environmental quality bond act which was referred to, is going to be before the voters this November, has not yet been approved and is a state proposition which would make a certain portion of the money available for sensitive land acquisition. Now we're starting to get off the subject here and the subject is the draft environmental impact statement. So I would recognize anyone who wishes to be heard concerning the draft environmental impact statement and how adequately it has addressed your concerns concerning the environmental impact of such a facility. There will be yet another hearing as we go through the procedure as I said which deals with the special permit application. That is the time that is afforded to people to say that you are opposed to the application because or are you are in favor of the application because. This hearing is set aside to deal with the draft form of the environmental impact statement which the Board must decide to accept or to send back to the applicants for revision concerning some of the comments that were heard here tonight. Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard? That being the case and without objection, I declare the hearing closed."

There being no further business on motion or vote, the meeting closed at 8:25 p.m.

IJP:nm

Irene J. Pendzick  
Town Clerk